

Appl. No. 10/696,812  
Examiner: James M Hewitt, Art Unit 3679  
In response to the Office Action dated October 1, 2004

Date: January 1, 2005  
Attorney Docket No. 10111396

## REMARKS

Responsive to the Office Action mailed on October 1, 2004 in the above-referenced application, Applicant respectfully requests amendment of the above-identified application in the manner identified above and that the patent be granted in view of the arguments presented. No new matter has been added by this amendment.

### Present Status of Application

After this amendment, claim 1-3 are pending. Claims 1-2 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Cassidy (US 6,206,654).

In this paper, new claim 3 is added. Support for new claim 3 can be found in Figs. 8A and 8B and pages 13-14 of the specification. The specification is amended to correct a typographical error and add a new paragraph on page 14. Support for the new paragraph can be found in Figs. 8A and 8B.

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in light of the amendments and the remarks contained below.

### Rejections Under 102(e)

Claims 1-2 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Cassidy. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections for the reasons as follow.

Cassidy teaches an air mattress inflation apparatus. In column 1, lines 61-67, Cassidy teaches:

The internal pressure of the air mattress can be increased by activating the motor and blower and a valve, pressurizing the housing and directing pressurized air to the air mattress. ***The internal pressure of the air mattress can be decreased by activating a valve, and releasing air in the air mattress through the housing and out to the ambient.*** [emphasis added]

Appl. No. 10/696,812  
Examiner: James M Hewitt, Art Unit 3679  
In response to the Office Action dated October 1, 2004

Date: January 1, 2005  
Attorney Docket No. 10111396

In connection with decreasing the internal pressure of the air mattress, in column 5, lines 26-33, Cassidy teaches:

When the sliding wipers 120B1 and 120B2 are moved to the right, the contact 118B2 is energized and a conductor 122B provides electrical energy to the solenoid valve 86B, opening it. ***The open solenoid valve 86B allows air under low pressure in the bladder 14B to flow back into the interior 40 of the housing 38 and exhaust through the intake muffler 50,*** thus lowering the pressure and reducing the firmness of the bladder 14B on one side of the air mattress 12. [emphasis added]

Cassidy does not teach or suggest an inflatable body comprising, *inter alia*, an air pump, in which the air pump has a first pair of electrodes and a second pair of electrodes, the air pump operating in a first direction when the first pair of electrodes contact each other, the air pump operating in a second, reverse direction opposite to the first direction when the second pair of electrodes contact each other, as recited in claim 1.

MPEP 2131 prescribes that to anticipate a claim, a reference must teach every element of the claim. In this regard, the Federal Circuit has held:

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

"The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

In Cassidy, the movement of sliding wipers 120B1 and 120B2 to energize contact 118B2 and provide electric energy to open valve 86B allows air to flow from bladder 14B to the ambient, thus lowering the internal pressure of the bladder. However, Cassidy does not teach or suggest

Appl. No. 10/696,812  
Examiner: James M Hewitt, Art Unit 3679  
In response to the Office Action dated October 1, 2004

Date: January 1, 2005  
Attorney Docket No. 10111396

that the air pump is caused to operate in a second, reverse direction opposite to a first direction when a second pair of electrodes contact each other, as recited in claim 1 of the application.

Applicant therefore submits that Cassidy does not teach or suggest that each and every element recited in claim 1. For at least this reason, Applicant's belief that claim 1 is allowable over the cited reference. Insofar as claims 2-3 depend from claim 1, it is Applicant's belief that these claims are also in condition for allowance.

Prior Art in Earlier Application

This application is a divisional application of U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/886,030. The Examiner is reminded to consider the prior art cited in the parent application. MPEP 609 and 2001.06(b).

Conclusion

The Applicant believes that the application is now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests so.

Respectfully submitted,



Nelson A. Quintero  
Reg. No. 52,143  
Customer No. 34,283  
Telephone: (310) 401-6180

P108693NAQ